potential for nonzero V can be deduced from Fig. 3 of Ref. 1. This figure shows that the discharge is located downstream of the electrodes, in the freejet region. In the freejet region the pressure is lower than in the interelectrode region. Consequently, the breakdown voltage in this region is lower.

In general, prior to breakdown in noble gases, the electron drift velocity term $V_e/4D_e$ in Eq. (1) is much greater than the gas velocity term, $V^2/4D_e.^2$ Therefore, the breakdown electric field of gases in subsonic or supersonic MHD devices will generally be independent of gas convective effects.

Subsequent to breakdown, one obtains[2] an expression similar to Eq. (1) for the magnitude of the electric field necessary to sustain the discharge in the presence of transverse convective effects. However, the electron drift velocity term does not appear in the equation for the discharge-sustaining voltage. One, therefore, finds that for MHD devices the gas velocity term is generally much larger than the terms due to plasma transport phenomena. Thus, the discharge is generally controlled by gas convective effects. One usually obtains a discharge structure similar to that shown in Fig. 3, Ref. 1. Further details on this phenomena can be found in Ref. 4.

References

[1] Gardner, J. A., "Effects of a Dynamic Gas on Breakdown Potential," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 7, July 1968, pp. 1414–1415.

[2] Wilhelm, H. E. and Zauderer, B., "Formation of a Quasi-Neutral Plasma in a Hydrodynamic Channel Flow," *Electricity from MHD*, Vol. II, International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria, 1968, pp. 733–744.

[3] Brown, S. C., *Basic Data of Plasma Physics*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

[4] Zauderer, B., "Discharge Structure and Stability of a Non-Equilibrium Plasma in a Magnetohydrodynamic Channel Flow," *The Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 11, No. 12, 1968, pp. 2577–2585.

Reply by Author to B. Zauderer

JACK A. GARDNER*

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

THE explanation given by Zauderer to the reduction in the breakdown potential for a dynamic condition is certainly one possibility for describing such an effect. However, the work reported in Ref. 1 indicated that the onset of breakdown does not occur in the "U-shaped" form as shown in Fig. 3 of Ref. 2, but the onset of breakdown most likely occurred within the upstream quarter of the electrode surface. The photograph shown in Fig. 4 of Ref. 1 exhibits a vertical plasma column between and within the electrode surfaces. It should be noted that the discharge shown in Fig. 3 of Ref. 2 refers to a typical *continuously* operating discharge between flat parallel-plate electrodes with the presence of a gas flow and therefore does not necessarily represent the conditions present during the onset of breakdown.

The pressure differential between the electrode region and the freejet region was measured and found to be negligible. The uniform pressure is a consequence of the subsonic velocity and the fact that the region between the electrodes was open to the vacuum chamber on all sides. Therefore this would certainly not be compatible with the measured reduction in

breakdown potential of 50–80% below that required for stagnation conditions.

References

[1] J. A. Gardner, "Dynamic Gas Effects on the Breakdown Potential for Helium, Nitrogen, and Argon," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 8, Aug. 1969, pp. 1639–1641.

[2] J. A. Gardner, "Effects of a Dynamic Gas on Breakdown Potential," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 7, July 1968, pp. 1414–1415.

Comment on "Optimum Discrete Approximation of the Maxwell Distribution"

D. P. GIDDENS* AND A. B. HUANG†

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

IN Ref. 1, a set of discrete velocities and weighting coefficients is presented which optimizes a discrete approximation to the Maxwellian equilibrium distribution function. We would like to point out that this optimization has been obtained and reported some time ago and has been utilized in the solution of several rarefied gasdynanic flow problems. In Refs. 2–4, this was referred to as the "modified quadrature" or the "half-range quadrature." The same one-dimensional values for the discrete velocities and weighting coefficients which appear in Ref. 1 also appear in Ref. 5, which due to unfortunate delays was not printed until recently. However, the values were published much earlier in Ref. 6 for the same number of discretizations (up to 8 levels).

The derivation used in Ref. 1 is essentially that of Refs. 5 and 6 although the descriptive phrasing is somewhat different. We took the approach that

$$\int_0^\infty g(v_x) e^{-v_x^2}\, dv_x \cong \sum_{j=1}^N H_j\, g(\alpha_j) \tag{1}$$

where H_j are the weighting coefficients corresponding to the discrete velocities α_j and $g(v_x)$ is any function for which the integral is defined. The H_j and α_j are determined under the requirement that Eq. (1) is exact if $g(v_x)$ is a polynomial of degree $2N - 1$ or less. This corresponds to duplicating the first $2N$ moments of a normalized Maxwellian distribution. If g is not such a polynomial, then an error is incurred which depends upon the departure of g from this form. Equation (1) leads to the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^N H_j \alpha_j^k = \int_0^\infty v_x^k e^{-v_x^2}\, dv_x, \quad k = 0,1, \ldots, 2N - 1 \tag{2}$$

which is to be compared to Eq. (7) of Ref. 1

$$\sum_{i=1}^N K_i v_i^j = \frac{1}{(\pi)^{1/2}} \int_0^\infty v^j e^{-v^2}\, dv, \quad j = 0,1, \ldots, 2N - 1$$

Thus, the one-dimensional K_i of Ref. 1 and the H_j of Ref. 5 differ by a factor of $1/(\pi)^{1/2}$ due to the normalizations used. The α_j and v_i are identical.